

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

JEHAN SEMPER,

Plaintiff,

v.

JBC LEGAL GROUP, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. C04-2240L

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
REQUEST FOR INJUNCTIVE
RELIEF

This matter comes before the Court on "Plaintiff's Motion for Declaratory Judgment and Injunctive Relief." Dkt. # 47.¹ Plaintiff seeks an injunction prohibiting defendants from continuing their operations "until adequate [debt collection] procedures are written, implemented and verified by the appropriate authority." Dkt. # 47 at 5.

Plaintiff is not entitled to the relief requested. Now that defendants have ceased all efforts to collect on the alleged debt, plaintiff's only claim is for past damages arising out of alleged statutory violations. Plaintiff is not currently being harmed by defendants' conduct, she has not established a real and immediate threat of future harm, and she has no standing to assert rights belonging to third parties. "Past exposure to illegal conduct does not, in and of itself show a present case or controversy" justifying injunctive relief. Easyriders Freedom F.I.G.H.T. v.

¹ Despite its title, the motion seeks only injunctive, not declaratory, relief.

ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S REQUEST
FOR INJUNCTIVE RELIEF

1 Hannigan, 92 F.3d 1486, 1495 n.5 (9th Cir. 1996) (quoting O'Shea v. Littleton, 414 U.S. 488,
2 495 (1974)).

3 In her reply memorandum, plaintiff argues that defendants' possession of her
4 confidential identification and financial information places her at risk for public disclosures such
5 as occurred earlier in this litigation. The Court has advised both parties of their obligations to
6 protect such information from future disclosures: no further injunctive relief is necessary at this
7 point. In addition, the injunction plaintiff seeks, namely the cessation of defendants' operations
8 until appropriate debt collection policies are put into place, would not lessen or alleviate the risk
9 that private and confidential information will again be disclosed during this litigation.

10
11 For all of the foregoing reasons, plaintiff's motion for injunctive relief is DENIED.

12
13
14 DATED this 29th day of August, 2005.

15
16 

17 Robert S. Lasnik
18 United States District Judge
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26